Highlights of Integrated Resource Management In Alberta - Year 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD 3

INTRODUCTION 4

A. IRM Guiding Principles and Criteria 5

B. IRM CRITERIA 7

PROJECT EXAMPLES: 7

CRITERIA SUMMARY: 7

C. IRM MEASURES OF SUCCESS: 35

APPENDIX: 36

For copies of this report contact:

Information Centre
Alberta Environment
Main Floor, Great West Life Building
9920 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T5K 2M4

ISBN 0-7785-2029-3 (Printed Edition)
ISBN 0-7785-2031-5 (On-line Edition)
Pub No. I/904 (Printed, On-Line Edition)

FORWARD

The development of this report was based on contributions from the Integrated Resource Management (IRM) Working Group, and the Regional Environmental Coordinators. However, the final review and delivery of this report was by the Integrated Resource Management Division (IRMD). As well, Special acknowledgement is given to the members of the report *Focus Committee* who worked to develop the IRM planning criteria. These members include:

- Chinwe Okelu, Alberta Municipal Affairs
- Kevin Crockett, Alberta Economic Development
- Robert Harrison, Alberta Environment
- Kevin Williams, Alberta Energy
- Cam Lane, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development

The second phase of this project included an evaluation of the criteria using projects identified in the Highlights of 2000 report. Thank you the following individuals for submitting evaluations:

- David Weeks, Alberta Environment.
- Andy Lamb, Alberta Environment.
- Ian Dyson, Alberta Environment
- Sherry Hazelaar, Alberta Environment
- Mike Boyd, Alberta Environment
- Sam Wirzba, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development
- Cam Lane, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development

INTRODUCTION

In 1999, the Alberta Government reaffirmed its commitment to sustainable resource and environmental management with the policy *Alberta's Commitment to Sustainable Resource and Environmental Management*. This policy reiterates the government's vision of a healthy environment, economy and quality of life for present and future generations. Based on this *Commitment Document* a set of guiding principles were approved by Sustainable Development Coordinating Council (SDCC) through Alberta's Commitment to Sustainable Resource and Environmental Management "Implementation Plan" (February 1999). "Highlights of Integrated Resource Management (IRM) - 2001" establishes specific planning criteria and measures of success based on the approved IRM guiding principles. In the future, these criteria may be used to evaluate whether projects or resource decisions have achieved IRM principles.

The Highlights of IRM in Alberta - Year 2000 focused on examples of IRM within Alberta during 1999-2000 http://www.gov.ab.ca/env/forests/irm/irm_hilites.html. It was successful in reporting the wide variety of IRM strategies and projects as well as various tools of the IRM approach, i.e. public involvement, monitoring, research, and links to business plans. However, we need to examine the process for IRM decisions and planning projects. What makes a good IRM decision or project? At the September 2000, Integrated Resource Management Division's (IRMD) Workshop on Alberta's Commitment to Sustainable Resource and Environmental Management, it was identified that criteria must be established to guide and evaluate planning projects. The criteria may also form the basis of a system of performance measures for IRM, as recommended by the Auditor General.

The approved *Implementation Plan* established a set of underlying values, i.e. respect, fairness and integrity, stewardship, excellence and inclusiveness to guide IRM decision-making. The guiding principles translate these values into action, by guiding the delivery of IRM:

The principles are considered together at the start and during decision-making and in subsequent implementation. Using these approved guiding principles as the initiation point this report attempts to:

A. Identify specific planning and decision-making criteria for determining whether or not each IRM guiding principle has been considered.

B. Evaluate identified IRM projects based on these established criteria; this is an attempt to put the criteria into a more applicable context for future planners or decision-makers.

C. This report also attempts to further evaluate these IRM guiding principles by listing broad IRM Measures of Success, i.e. a measurable outcome to determine whether IRM decision-making or planning has been successful within the province.

A. IRM Guiding Principles and Criteria

The IRM guiding principles are listed below, with a short description directly from the "Implementation Plan". Following each principle is an alphabetic list of criteria. These criteria attempt to direct resource planners and decision-makers on how IRM principles could be evaluated or measured. How would one know whether IRM principles were being incorporated during a resource plan or decision? These criteria attempt to provide this measure.

1. Comprehensive and integrated – natural resource management decision-making will consider the full range of environmental, social, health and economic interests and values and integrate their management into an effective whole.

a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.
b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.
c) Full range of interests is used in assessment.
d) An appropriate amount of analysis was used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health and economic interests and values.
e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.
f) Cumulative effects of all activities and procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.

2. Proactive and Predictable – IRM will be future-oriented. It will attempt to anticipate natural resource management issues and needs to provide a more-predictable context for those who wish to use or enjoy Alberta's natural resources.

a) Explicit consideration of future conditions was considered in the project or decision.
b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.
c) Outcomes provide clear direction.

3. Responsive and Flexible – management will be adaptive, responding to experience, new information, shifts in social preference, technological innovations and unexpected situations.

a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.
b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.
c) Use a hierarchical planning process.
d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.
e) Periodic review of social preferences.

4. Consultative – those affected by decisions will be consulted before action is taken. Open communication will be supported.

a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.

b) Process supports open communication.
c) Type/quality of new information generated.
d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with the process, the opportunity to participate, the use of input received.
e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.

5. *Procedurally Fair* – decision-making processes will adhere to the principles of administrative fairness, and will provide public access to relevant information.
a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy.
b) Where a decision is required, principles defined by administrative law regarding administrative fairness will be applied (appendix).

6. *Knowledge-based* – decision-making will be based on understanding the potential consequences of choices.
a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.
b) Use of best available information.

7. *Timely and Results-oriented* – decision making processes will strive for efficient use of time and financial resources. Decision should contribute to achieving government's goals and objectives.
a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.
b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.
c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.
d) Use of appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.
e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.
f) Desired outcomes required by the client are defined up front.

8. *Accountable* – Lines of accountability for processes, products and implementation must be clear. Decision-makers will be accountable for their decisions.
a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.
b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.
c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.

9. *Clear and Understandable* – products and processes will be straightforward, not open to a wide range of interpretations. Roles and responsibilities will be well defined.
a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).
b) Use of plain language.
c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.

B. IRM CRITERIA

PROJECT EXAMPLES:

The following projects provide examples of where some of the listed criteria have been achieved. This is not an inclusive list of IRM projects but rather a compilation of recognized projects from the Highlights of IRM In Alberta 2000 report. The attempt is to show how these criteria could be used to evaluate projects towards adopting IRM principles; secondly it attempts to provide some context to the established criteria.

Evaluations were completed for the following projects listed in Highlights of IRM In Alberta 2000:

1. **Northern East Slopes Sustainable Resource and Environmental Management Strategy.**
2. **Regional Sustainable Development Strategy for the Athabasca Oil Sands Area.**
3. **Energy Prairie Project.**
4. **Alberta Prairie Conservation Forum.**
5. **Grizzly Bear Conservation in the Yellowhead Ecosystem - A strategic framework.**
6. **West Yellowhead Corridor Commercial Tourism and Recreation Development Project.**
7. **The Whitehorse Wildland Park Management Plan.**
8. **Northern East Slopes guidelines for integrating timber harvesting and domestic grazing in the green area.**

CRITERIA SUMMARY:

These criteria can be used to assist with evaluating of a variety of projects, as shown within the project examples. However, the scope and scale of the projects may influence how useful some of the criteria are towards representing the meaning of the IRM principles. For example, considering the following principle:

> *"Comprehensive and integrated natural resource management decision-making will consider the full range of environmental, social, health and economic interests and values and integrate their management into an effective whole."*

This principle, and therefore the supporting criteria, are particularly important for broad, regional projects and less with more specific, operational projects where the focus is on one or two sectors and/or within a relatively small geographic area. This emphasises the need for a multi-layered or scaled approach to integrated resource management, including regional, sub-regional, and operational integration. These projects identify these scales by through a variety of issues.

In the future, project managers to evaluate whether projects or resource decisions have achieved the approved IRM principles may use these criteria. These criteria may also form the basis of developing a set of IRM performance measures, as recommended by the Auditor General.

Name of evaluator: **David Weeks** Project name: The NES Sustainable Resource and Environmental Strategy

Description of Project: The Northern East Slopes Sustainable Resource and Environmental Management Strategy (NES Strategy) is a new initiative of the Alberta Government to integrate economic, environmental and community values into the planning process for regional sustainable development. This project works to support Alberta's commitment to sustainable development, described in the 1999 document *Alberta's Commitment to Sustainable Resource and Environmental Management.*

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.	√			
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.			√	The NES Strategy Regional Steering Group is in the process of creating Task Teams to gather information and provide recommendations concerning priority issues. This process will be ongoing and likely to cover a broad range of issues.
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.	√			All stakeholders consulted many times throughout the Strategy development. Opportunities for stakeholder presentation to the RSG also available.
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.			√	Analysis work in preliminary stages. Task Teams to address Social (Health included), Biological and Economic issues will be developed in the next few weeks.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.			√	Some interrelationships have been identified by the RSG. Work on relationships will continue throughout the process.
	f) Cumulative effects of all activities are procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.		√		Work on cumulative effects will be commencing shortly utilizing the ALCES model.
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.	√			
	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.		√		Scenarios will be developed as part of the NES Strategy process. Future scenarios will be developed shortly.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.			√	Final work on the Strategy outcomes is not completed.

3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.		√		NES Strategy has not been finalized. Adaptive management system is currently being considered.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	√			
	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.	√			
	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.	√			
	e) Periodic review of social preferences.	√			Process will be ongoing with review at regular intervals.
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.	√			Consultation with stakeholder groups ongoing.
	b) Process supports open communication.	√			Ongoing stakeholder consultation and opportunities for stakeholder presentations.
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.			√	New information is currently being gathered and will continue until project completion.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.			√	Some concerns over Ministerial delay in releasing project documents.
	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.		√		Resolutions have not been completed, Project ongoing.
5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.	√			
	b) Admininstrative fairness	√			
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.			√	Further work is ongoing.
	b) Use of best available information.	√			Information gathering and analysis is ongoing.
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.	√			RSG Terms of reference defined.
	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.	√			
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.	√			
	d) Use of an appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.	√			
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.			√	NES Strategy is still ongoing. Analysis has only begun.

	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.			√	Some confusion surrounding the final product of the NES Strategy between various groups.
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.	√			
	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.	√			Outlined within the Terms of Reference.
	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.			√	Availability of skilled staff and budgets unknown at current point in the process.
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).	√			
	b) Use of plain language.	√			
	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.	√			Documents to date have been clear and understandable.

Name of evaluator: Mike Boyd

Project name: Regional Sustainable Development Strategy for the Athabasca Oil Sands Area

Description of Project: The purpose of the RSDS is to provide a framework for managing cumulative environmental effects and to ensure sustainable development in the Athabasca oil sands area. The strategy was designed with the full and active participation of regional parties. It provides a balance between the need to comply with the regulatory authority of the government and the need to share regional stewardship of natural resources and the environment with stakeholders. This ongoing approach is expected to help resolve environmental issues in a collaborative fashion and to minimize confrontational approaches such as legal hearings and court challenges.

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.	X			72 environmental issues were initially identified through extensive consultation with regional stakeholders with the help of the Cumulative Environmental Management Association (CEMA). The issues were grouped according to similarities and a list of 14 themes was developed. The themes were then sorted into three categories based on urgency and information gaps.
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.			X	5 working groups have been tasked to identify information needs to develop management objectives for priority issues.
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.	X			Working groups are composed of various stakeholders including, environmental non-governmental organizations, industry, government, First Nations, and Aboriginal communities, and government.
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.			X	Social and economic analysis may not be as intensive as environmental, health, and values analysis.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.	X			Most management objectives will be interrelated – new objectives will be merged with existing ones. When one objective is set, one or more of the others may have to be adjusted. As new data becomes available, and as the structure of the RSDS matures, the objectives and indicators may need to be modified to incorporate new information.

	f) Cumulative effects of all activities and procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.			X	Assessment of economic aspects of cumulative effects may not be as intensive as assessment of environmental and social cumulative effects.
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.			X	Development scenarios for future states of terrestrial impacts and air emissions are part of working group plans. An adaptive management approach is used to modify objectives as new information becomes available..
	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.	X			Issues have been developed from EUB hearings, and Environmental Impact Assessments. Issues were confirmed with stakeholders during RSDS design process.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.	X			The outcome is an environmental management system with clear objectives, management practices and evaluation cycle.
3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.	X			The RSDS and CEMA working groups are developing adaptive management systems to deal with the major issues and themes. The first step in the management system is to define what stakeholders value and how they envision a sustainable environment. The working groups will recommend specific management objectives, which will be achieved by implementing management strategies and tools. Long-term monitoring is a means of evaluating success in meeting the objectives. Future changes to the management systems will be recommended based on results of the monitoring.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	X			Working groups initiate work plans by scoping issues to a level of resolution desired for preparation of detailed work plans. Work plans will include objectives, rationale, tasks, schedules, budgets, and sources of funding and in-kind resources. Levels of detail in planning are confirmed and tested with public and industry stakeholders
	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.	X			RSDS fits in the Provincial IRM policy document released by Premier in March 1999.

	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.	X			Policy decisions made at cabinet and ministerial level. Regional implementation decisions made at Director level. Administrative implementation occurs at staff level.
	e) Periodic review of social preferences.	X			CEMA working groups have confirmed social values and preferences that originally were identified in the RSDS.
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.	X			Stakeholder groups not represented at CEMA, but could be affected by product decisions are considered. Working groups are required to identify such groups and incorporate their input, on a consultation basis, as part of its process leading up to its recommendation. The Communications Committee will advise on the process of consultation. Recommendations accepted by members will be communicated to the general public through normal means. (from Draft Addendum to Decision Making Policy for CEMA)
	b) Process supports open communication.	X			CEMA and its working groups allow participation of all stakeholders and strives to have representation from all sectors. Working groups are operated in such a way to meet the needs of participants including discussion of all issues brought to the table.
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.	X			CEMA work groups generating science-based literature reviews and reviews of monitoring activities. Management objectives will be set based on a consensus decision by stakeholders. The regional information system is under development to synthesize resource and environmental information relevant to management of region's environment.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.	X			Measured by attendance and support of CEMA work.. Input by stakeholders is cornerstone of CEMA work groups.

	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.	X			CEMA is accountable for its activities and decisions to all its stakeholders. CEMA uses consensus decision making for recommendations
5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.	X			Stakeholders on the working groups have access to all relevant information and products from contracts and other assignments. Stakeholders participate fully in the process, which is a consensus model.
	b) Administrative fairness	X			CEMA Members who require support for effective participation will be provided with financial assistance consistent with the guidelines of CEMA's Member Support Funding Policy.
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.	X			Development scenario information used by Sustainable Ecosystems Working Group (SEWG). Long-term air emissions forecast used by NOx-SO_2 Working Group.
	b) Use of best available information.	X			Responsible environmental management relies on the most up-to-date data, such as scientific information, resource inventory, impact assessment and traditional environmental knowledge. Research and monitoring provide a clearer understanding of how resource development affects the environment. They are used to help set guidelines for commercial activities, as well as to measure how well industry follows the regulatory requirements. The computer models used to predict the impact on the environment rely on monitoring to determine how accurate their predictions are, and on research to improve their accuracy and precision - within bounds of budget considerations, best information available is assessed.
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.	X			RSDS "Blueprints for Action" lays out proposed timelines for products. Working groups further refine timelines according to information gathered and develop detailed workplans which are approved by CEMA.

	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.	X			Themes laid out in the Blueprints for Action of RSDS. Working groups have defined a Terms of Reference indicating the groups objectives and goals and develop detailed workplans which are approved by CEMA.
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.	X			Working groups initiate work planning by first scoping the issue to a level of resolution desired for preparation of detailed work plans. The work plans will include objectives, rationale, tasks, schedules, budgets, and sources of funding and in-kind resources.
	d) Use of an appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.			X	Pace of stakeholder participatory model may at times be at odds with meeting project deadlines; however, this model has highest potential for stakeholder buy-in.
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.	X			CEMA working groups define analysis as part of working group plans and are approved by CEMA.
	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.	X			Outcomes confirmed as part of the annual planning and budget process and reviewed at quarterly CEMA meetings
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.	X			CEMA Working Groups roles are identified in their Terms of Reference.
	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.	X			CEMA Working Group participants' roles are identified in their Terms of Reference (leader, specialist, support, etc.).
	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.	X			Participatory process involves significant staff time and resources for meaningful stakeholder input.
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).			X	A variety of acronyms are used to describe working groups as well as the strategy. Definition and inventory of acronyms are presented in RSDS document.
	b) Use of plain language.			X	Plain language is used in the RSDS document where appropriate. Technical jargon is avoided; however, due to the technical nature of this initiative, some technical language is required.

	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.			X	Plain language is used in the RSDS document where appropriate. Technical jargon is avoided; however, due to the technical nature of this initiative, some technical language is required. Plain language newsletter is regularly distributed to update clients on progress of technical committee.

Name of evaluator: **Sherry Hazelaar** Project name: Energy Prairie Project

Description of Project:

The Energy Prairie Project involves a review of the EUB *Information Letter (IL) 96-9: Revised Guidelines for Minimizing Disturbance on Native Prairie Areas*. The review reflects the continuing improvement in industry practices and our understanding of native prairie and parkland environments. The final product consists of three documents. The first document is the revised Information Letter *(IL) 2001-xx Revised Guidelines for Minimizing Surface Disturbance in Native Prairie and Parkland Areas,* which encompasses a general set of principles. The second document, *Petroleum Industry Activity in Native Prairie and Parkland Areas: Guidelines for Minimizing Surface Disturbance,* is a set of detailed guidelines that identify recommended best practices for the petroleum industry. The third document, *Prairie Oil and Gas: A Lighter Footprint* is meant to complement the information in the first 2 documents in a user-friendly format with graphics to assist readers in interpreting the guidelines. The former two documents will be released shortly; the latter is currently available.

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.	x			The documents apply to all disturbances associated with petroleum industry development.
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.	x			The revised IL provides the general framework and more detailed information is provided in the associated guidelines.
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.	x			Interests analyzed from an industry, regulatory, environmental and public perspective.
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.	x			All factors considered.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.	x			Issues are tied together by the nature of the activity.
	f) Cumulative effects of all activities are procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.	x			The documents address the need for industry to examine cumulative effects of each project and plan accordingly.
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.	x			The documents encourage industry to consider future development plans while in the pre-planning stages in order to protect the native prairie and parkland now and in the future.

	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.			x	Documents address current issues in order to protect a resource in the future.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.			x	The documents are detailed but site specific problems must be addressed on a case by case basis.
3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.	x			The Energy Prairie Project is a result of an ongoing process to monitor the effectiveness of existing guidelines and to reflect continuing improvement in industry practice and our understanding of native prairie and parkland issues.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	x			The IL covers the general principles and the guidelines provide more specific information.
	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.	X			
	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.	X			Decision making done in consultation with regulators, industry and the public.
	e) Periodic review of social preferences.	x			The project was undertaken to review the current practice and reflect continuing improvement.
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.	X			The documents underwent a thorough consultation process.
	b) Process supports open communication.	X			A considerable amount of time was spent soliciting and incorporating feedback.
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.	X			Process reflects an increased understanding of the issues due to new information generated.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.			x	Stakeholders found public consultation process to be lengthy. Many different views presented and was challenging to incorporate comments which were representative of the feedback.
	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.				Pending
5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.	x			The produced documents are public information.
	b) Administrative fairness	x			Transparent process with public consultation.
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.	x			This is the second update of the IL since it was originally released in 1992 to reflect new information, values and industry practice.

	b) Use of best available information.	x			Documents reflect the most current information available.
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.	x			Diverse working group struck to complete the project.
	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.	x			Purpose of working group is to update the IL. Purpose of the IL is to reduce impact on native prairie and parkland.
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.			x	Schedule was extended several times, final product to be released shortly.
	d) Use of an appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.			X	The end result of the working group's efforts will represent the group's original goals however it will not be in the format originally intended.
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.			x	Extensive analysis setback the original time line.
	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.	x			Documents reflect the client's desire for a one-window approach to finding information.
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.			x	Working group accountable for the quality of the review process through sign off by senior management.
	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.	x			Working group organized to complete the project.
	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.	x			Consultation with decision-makers, technical experts, industry and public to aid in final document.
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).	x			
	b) Use of plain language.	x			
	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.	x			The Prairie Oil and Gas document complements the first 2 documents and can be used as an educational tool. It contains many graphics to aid in interpreting the guidelines.

Name of evaluator:**Sam Wirzba/Ian Dyson** Project name: Prairie Conservation Forum (PCF)
Description of Project: The PCF exists to develop and implement (and act as a catalyst for the implementation of) the Alberta Prairie Conservation Action Plan: 2001 – 05 (PCAP). Three meetings are held each year to allow members to exchange information, to become informed on topics of interest ,and to assess strategic initiatives.

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.			x	PCF is **not** trying to be comprehensive in addressing all issues (opted for a strategic focus)
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.			x	Lack of $, staff, resources, time
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.			x	PCF participants are self-selecting; a broad spectrum of interests are represented.
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.			x	Formal, systematic analyses are not undertaken. Quick-and-dirty analyses prevail.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.			x	Inter-relationships are informally discussed
	f) Cumulative effects of all activities are procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.	x			Prairie Cumulative Effects model has been developed
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.	x			PCF tries to anticipate future threats to native prairie
	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.	x			Prairie Cumulative Effects model has been developed; unlimited scenarios can be querried.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.	x			PCAP provides strategic direction
3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.			x	PCF does not engage in formal monitoring. Effectiveness of the PCAP has not been formally assessed.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	x			Strategic thinking in a strategic plan.
	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.		x		Uses grassroots approach. PCAP was reviewed by member organisations.
	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.			x	Decisions are made by those who choose to participate and attend PCF meetings.

	e) Periodic review of social preferences.			x	Rely on broad and balanced membership.
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.		x		PCF acts within parameters of PCAP and the mandates and interests of its members. Opportunity to participate is provided and information disseminated widely.
	b) Process supports open communication.	x			Is a PCF operating principle
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.	x			Prairie and Parkland native vegetation inventories produced useful information.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.	x			Stakeholders are PCF participants. They seem satisfied.
	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.	x			PCF works toward consensus decisions. Members are free to cast a vote.
5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.			x	Not feasible to acquire or supply all relevant information. Furthermore, members lack time to review and digest information sent to them.
	b) Admininstrative fairness			x	PCF adheres to its Terms of Reference
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.	x			Prairie Cumulative Effects model has been developed
	b) Use of best available information.	x			Incorporated in Prairie Cumulative Effects model
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.	x			Process is agreed to by members or directed by PCF Terms of Reference
	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.	x			Annual Work Plan produced
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.			x	PCF is voluntary organization with no secured funding or formal budgets. Some initiatives experience significant delays.
	d) Use of an appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.	x			Process fits the initiative
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.			x	Never enough time or resources for full 'analysis'
	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.	x			PCF follows Annual Work Plan
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.	x			

	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.	x			Terms of Reference specify
	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.		x		PCF is voluntary organziation with no secured funding
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).	x			
	b) Use of plain language.	x			
	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.	x			

Name of evaluator: **Andy Lamb** Project name: **Grizzly Bear Conservation in the Alberta Yellowhead Ecosystem – A Strategic Framework**

Description of Project: Development of a collaborative approach between Jasper National Park and Alberta Environment for the long-term conservation of grizzly bears in the Alberta Yellowhead Ecosystem. The Strategic Framework will translate the data collected from intensive research programs into management objectives that will ensure the continued persistence of the species on the landscape of west-central Alberta.

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.			√	Within scope of grizzly bear conservation issue only.
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.	√			Initiation of Foothills Model Forest Grizzly Bear Research Program.
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.	√			
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.			√	Full investigation of the tradeoffs that may be required to maintain grizzly bears on the landscape was not completed since more information is required from ongoing research programs.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.	√			Key aspect was support and buy-in of various stakeholder groups.
	f) Cumulative effects of all activities are procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.			√	Incomplete information base
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.		√		Will be completed in implementation phase.
	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.			√	Interim Working Hypothesis adopted – landscape targets to be confirmed through research.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.	√			
3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.	√			Results of research program will be used to develop specific landscape condition targets.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	√			

	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.		√		The Grizzly Bear Framework operates across planning scales and its direction will be incorporated into a number of planning levels.
	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.	√			Decisions made at regional level with involvement/participation of Jasper National Park
	e) Periodic review of social preferences.		√		Will be carried out in NES Env Mgmt Strategy
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.	√			Workshops/stakeholder sessions held throughout process.
	b) Process supports open communication.	√			See above
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.			√	3-year research program initiated.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.			√	Stakeholders initially felt excluded from the process since they were not included in the development of initial drafts of the Framework. Subsequent workshops and consultation ensured ongoing involvement.
	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.	√			Industry/NGO buy-in was achieved.
5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.	√			
	b) Admininstrative fairness	√			
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.	√			
	b) Use of best available information.	√			Internationally/Nationally recognized research program.
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.			√	Development of the Framework was an iterative process that evolved as new challenges arose as a result of stakeholder consultation.
	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.			√	Goals and objectives were identified to stakeholders verbally but were not explicitly written.
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.		√		Schedule and budget could not be clearly defined since the success of the Framework was dependent on stakeholder support which had to be built throughout the process.
	d) Use of an appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.	√			
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.	√			

	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.			√	
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.	√			Detailed Terms of Reference were not prepared.
	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.			√	
	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.			√	
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).	√			
	b) Use of plain language.	√			
	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.	√			Final Framework document distributed to all stakeholders/clients.

Name of evaluator: **Andy Lamb** Project name: West Yellowhead Corridor Commercial Tourism and Recreation Development Project.

Description of Project: The West Yellowhead Corridor project identifies and focuses potential commercial tourism and recreation lease developments to nodes (on Crown lands) along the Highway 16 Corridor from Obed Lake to the east boundary of Jasper National Park Gates. The Project was developed in partnership with Yellowhead County, the Town of Hinton, Weldwood of Canada, Weyerhaeuser Canada and four provincial government departments.

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.	√			Within the scope of the project – commercial recreation and tourism development - all issues were considered.
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.	√			Inventory of constraints and opportunities of all potential sites was conducted.
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.	√			
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.			√	Social and health issues were not assessed except as raised during public consultation.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.	√			
	f) Cumulative effects of all activities are procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.			√	All potential activities were assessed. Formal CEA was not completed.
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.	√			Project was designed as forward-looking plan to focus development in the study area for the next 20-30 years.
	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.			√	Issue scans were not conducted but stakeholders were consulted periodically.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.	√			All future tourism and recreational development in the corridor will be focussed on the development nodes.
3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.	√			MOU will go through constant monitoring and 5 year review.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	√			
	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.	√			MOU takes direction from Coal Branch IRP
	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.	√			

	e) Periodic review of social preferences.	√			Will be undertaken through 5-year review.
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.	√			Regular public meetings/open houses held.
	b) Process supports open communication.	√			Partnership with industry and local government stakeholders.
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.			√	Inventory of sites used existing information.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.	√			Small minority of stakeholders felt process did not incorporate all of their input.
	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.	√			MOU signed by Alberta, Yellowhead County, Town of Hinton, Weldwood and Weyerhaeuser.
5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.	√			
	b) Administrative fairness	√			
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.			√	
	b) Use of best available information.	√			Consultant assessment of potential sites.
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.	√			Terms of Reference developed and approved by ERC
	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.	√			See above.
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.			√	Limited budget, schedule exceeded because of need to bring stakeholders on board.
	d) Use of an appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.	√			
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.	√			
	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.	√			
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.	√			Accountability to Extended ERC defined.
	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.	√			

	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.			√	Difficulty in obtaining input from staff experts on potential constraints of selected sites.
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).	√			
	b) Use of plain language.	√			
	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.	√			

- Name of evaluator: **Andy Lamb** Project name: The Whitehorse Wildland Park Management Plan.

Description of Project: The Whitehorse Wildland Park Management Plan was prepared under the direction of the Whitehorse Wildland Park Public Advisory Group (PAG) in approximately 1 year. The plan provides direction on how the park will be managed to allow public use and access to the park and to protect its unique resources and natural features.

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.			√	Issues considered were only those within the protected area and those outside influences which may affect the park.
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.	√			
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.	√			All stakeholders consulted and represented on the PAG.
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.			√	Social, health issues were not addressed.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.	√			
	f) Cumulative effects of all activities are procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.		√		A specific CEA was not conducted.
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.	√			Management objectives define levels of acceptable use
	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.			√	PAG directly involved in developing management objectives. Scenarios not developed.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.	√			Management Plan.
3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.	√			Five-year and ten-year reviews of the plan are specified.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	√			

	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.	√			Context provided by Coal Branch IRP and Access Management Plan.
	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.	√			Approved by ERC and signed off by ADM of NRS.
	e) Periodic review of social preferences.	√			Five, ten year reviews.
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.	√			PAG provided ongoing input plus public meetings held to review draft plan.
	b) Process supports open communication.	√			See above
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.			√	Use of existing information and data from field surveys.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.			√	PAG supportive – some members felt management objectives may be too restrictive.
	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.	√			
5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.	√			
	b) Administrative fairness	√			
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.			√	Not entirely science-based process
	b) Use of best available information.	√			
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.	√			PAG Terms of Reference defined.
	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.	√			
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.	√			
	d) Use of appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.	√			Project completed on schedule and within budget.
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.	√			
	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.	√			
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.	√			Accountability of PAG and Planning Team to ERC.

	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.	√			
	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.	√			Dedicated resources were provided by ERC – ensured project success.
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).	√			
	b) Use of plain language.	√			
	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.	√			Whitehorse Wildland Park Management Plan recognized as model for future park management planning in the province.

Name of evaluator: Cam Lane, SRD

Project name: Northern East Slopes Guidelines for Integrating Timber Harvesting and Domestic Grazing in the Green Area.

Description of Project:
Purpose: To assist timber and grazing operators successfully integrate timber harvesting, reforestation, and domestic grazing activities to achieve sustainable timber and forage production while considering other values.

As extraction of natural resources becomes more intensive there is a need to establish IRM practices, to ensure sustainable resources for all users. Concerns arising from regional timber operators and green area grazing disposition holders, have lead both parties to agree to look for better ways to integrate harvest and grazing management practices. With the government's continued commitment to stakeholder input, these regional guidelines were established with participation from affected timber operators and the Grazing Advisory Committee (GAC) from the Northern East Slopes Region, with final review by SRD.

Standards to integrate timber harvesting and domestic grazing were first established by the Alberta Timber Harvest Planning and Operating Ground Rules (1994). The guidelines were added to develop a communication and planning process for integrating harvesting and grazing operations. The standards and guidelines were both developed in accordance with the forest sector's legal obligation to meet provincial regeneration standards (Alberta Regeneration Survey Manual 2000). These guidelines should also be linked with zonal or FMA specific ground rules that address operational integration of grazing and harvesting operations.

Please indicate whether this project achieved each criteria by checking (√) yes, no, or partial and provide an explanation within the "why" column.

1. Comprehensive and integrated.	a) A comprehensive list of all issues has been considered.		√		This project focuses on operational integration between the forestry and agriculture sectors and was not intended to consider all issues.
	b) Relevant information gathered and used to address each issue.	√			Regulatory requirements and applicable research was used to develop the guidelines.
	c) Full range of interests are used in assessment.		√		Again focused on domestic grazing and timber production interests.
	d) An appropriate amount of analysis used to address issues, involving environmental, social, health, and economic interests and values.			√	Health not considered.
	e) Interrelationships of issues are assessed and addressed.	√			Specific reforestation and forage availability issues are addressed.

	f) Cumulative effects of all activities are procedures are assessed and incorporated into the project or decision.		√		This was not intended to assess cumulative effects but rather to establish a process whereby two sectors could incorporate sector values.
2. Proactive and predictable.	a) Explicit consideration of future conditions were considered.	√			Established a process that is relatively flexible to changing conditions.
	b) Future scenarios are developed based on issue scans and communication of stakeholder needs of the environment.			√	Informally investigating better ways to integrate through on-going communication with stakeholders.
	c) Outcomes provide clear direction.	√			
3. Responsive and flexible.	a) Adaptive management system based on monitoring of outcomes and whether designated indicators are valid.	√			Process incorporates adaptive management through a planning, operating, and monitoring cycle.
	b) Use appropriate level of detail in planning.	√			Checklist established indicating the appropriate amount of detail required.
	c) Use a hierarchical planning process.	√			Linked to forest management planning process, i.e. Detailed Forest Management Plan⇒ compartment assessment⇒ compartment design ⇒ annual operating plan.
	d) Decision-making is at the appropriate level.	√			Operational decision-making for operational integration.
	e) Periodic review of social preferences.			√	Periodic review, by the two sectors, is required, however, no formal review process incorporated to review other interests.
4. Consultative.	a) Those affected by decisions are consulted before decisions are made or action is taken.	√			Both parties work together to determine the appropriate course of action.
	b) Process supports open communication.	√			These guidelines articulate an open communication process.
	c) Type/quality of new information generated.			√	Not intended to provided new information, but may drive new information on how best to integrate.
	d) Degree of satisfaction expressed by stakeholder with process, opportunity to participate, and use of input.	√			The stakeholder's are directly involved with the process and formulating solutions.
	e) Stakeholder signoff on resolutions.	√			Both parties sign-off a "Silviculture-Range Working Agreement".

5. Procedurally fair	a) All relevant information is provided to stakeholders except as excluded by FOIPP.	√			Stakeholders meet to exchange pertinent information.
	b) Administrative fairness	√			Incorporates a dispute-resolution process.
6. Knowledge-based	a) Consideration of analysis forecasting of future consequences.			√	Not documented, should formally incorporate into document.
	b) Use of best available information.	√			On-site information used.
7. Timely and results-oriented	a) Process is well defined up front with identified roles and responsibilities.	√			Outline the process which identifies the objectives as well as the roles and responsibilities.
	b) Identification of goals and objectives up front.	√			
	c) Defined schedule and budget with recognition of time and resource constraints.			√	Schedule defined, but does not define budgetary expectations.
	d) Use of an appropriate planning process given time and resource constraints.	√			Linked with the forest management planning process.
	e) Appropriate amount of analysis to fit the required decision given the time and resource constraints.			√	This should occur, but may vary.
	f) Desired outcomes required by the client is up front.	√			Standards "must-do's" are defined and supported by a set of guidelines that suggest a process for achieving the standards.
8. Accountable.	a) Defined lines of accountability through detailed terms of reference.			√	No terms of reference, but the process outlines who is accountable.
	b) Defined roles and responsibility of all participants throughout the process.	√			Tables define roles of government (SRD), as well as grazing and timber operators.
	c) Adequate resources, i.e. skilled staff and budgets, available to meet decision-making process.			√	Requires input from the grazing and timber operators, which may have limited resources pending on the specific situation.
9. Clear and understandable.	a) Use of clear terminology and definitions (no acronyms).	√			Document defines terminology and acronyms.
	b) Use of plain language.	√			
	c) All documents are clear and in a form understandable by the clients.			√	Main guidelines document is overwhelming to some clients. We are presently drafting a companion information brochure that simplifies the process.

C. IRM MEASURES OF SUCCESS:

If individual IRM decisions or projects were effective they should contribute to a higher level outcome or success? The following measures attempt to recognize these outcomes.

- Reduction in time (cost) for industry to get projects through the regulatory process.
- Increasing level of natural resource investment in the province.
- Implementations of new procedures/practises that are streamlined where appropriate.
- Increased amount and depth of feedback from consultation sessions.
- Reduction in the number of court challenges, board/panel hearings, and land management appeals.
- Confirmations that decision results are consistent with the project goals and objectives.
- Maintenance of environmental health, integrity and range of natural variability.

APPENDIX:

The concept of administrative fairness is based on the recognition of "natural justice" or "procedural fairness" which has evolved through the courts to ensure that the decisions of administrative bodies are arrived at fairly.

The following principles are considered to be the minimum procedural protection on which persons affected by the decisions of governments are entitled to rely:

- the right to be heard.
- the right to adequate notice.
- the right to disclosure.
- the right to rebut opposing evidence and to correct prejudicial statements.
- the right to an unbiased decision-maker.
- the right to reasons for decisions.
- the right to have the decision based on evidence.

Any administrative body can establish and promote an environment of fairness by adhering to the principles of natural justice. The Office of the Ombudsman encourages administrative bodies to apply these principles and develop a standard of service that is consistent and clear. (The Obudsman Act).